DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 320 IR 004 883

AUTHOR Sachs, Steven G.; Abedor, Allan J.
TITLE FD, OD, and ID, What's the Relationship: Or--New Wineskins Anyone?
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (Miami Beach, Florida, April 26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; Faculty Development; Instructional Design; Instructional Improvement; Instructional Innovation; Organizational Change; Organizational Development; Post Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

This paper defines faculty development (FD), organization development (OD), and instructional development (ID), and discusses the interrelationships between them in effecting change in an institution of higher education. FD and OD provide the individual and organizational readiness necessary for adoption of an innovation, while ID focuses on the systematic design, development, and evaluation of educational materials, courses, etc. FD, OD, and ID are not new ideas, but are useful expository devices which allow the categorization of activities fundamentally related to the adoption of innovations. (Author/STS)

FD, OD, AND ID, WHAT'S THE RELATIONSHIP:

OR--NEW WINESKINS ANYONE?

by

Allan J. Abedor, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, Educational Development Program
Michigan State University

and

Steven G. Sachs, Ph.D.
Consultant, Learning & Evaluation Service
Michigan State University

presented to

Division of Instructional Development
Association for Educational Communication and Technology

Miami Beach, Florida
April 26, 1977

FD, OD, AND ID, WHAT'S THE RELATIONSHIP: OR--NEW WINESKINS ANYONE?

INTRODUCTION

A recent trend in higher education has been to establish centers, agencies or programs having as their purpose, helping faculty members improve their instructional effectiveness. Recently, a great deal of attention has been devoted to describing the activities of such agencies in terms of discrete categories titled Faculty Development (FD), Organizational Development (OD), and Instructional Development (ID). (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1975). Briefly, FD activities focus on the knowledge, skills, sensitivities and techniques of faculty members rather than the courses they teach. OD activities seek to change the structure, policies, and organizational environment in which instruction takes place. ID activities, on the other hand, focus on the systematic design, development and evaluation of instructional materials, lessons, courses or curricula.

Assuming that these three kinds of activities are involved in instructional improvement, what is their relationship to each other? Must an instructional improvement program encompass all three? Is there some priority or hierarchy among the three? Are they independent of one another? Is there some optimal sequence of these activities? If instructional improvement agencies are to provide services which will materially help their institutions and if these agencies are to successfully plan for their future, it is necessary to understand the relationships which link these three categories of activities.

We suggest that underlying the relationships between FD, OD, and ID is the concept of change. If instruction is to improve, something related to instruction must change. The instructional process or content must change, or the faculty member's knowledge, skills, or attitudes must change, or the organizational environment must change.

For change to take place, the individuals affected must want to change, and there must be some new idea, practice, or object available to those wishing to change. An idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual has been defined as an innovation (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971). Hence, we suggest that the entire range of instructional improvement activities, FD, OD, and ID, can be regarded as techniques related to adoption of an innovation (new idea, practice or object) by faculty. Therefore, to understand the relationships between FD, OD, and ID, it is necessary to understand the process involved in faculty adoption of innovations related to instruction.

THE ADOPTION OF INNOVATIONS

Consider what must take place before a faculty member will adopt an innovation related to instruction, whether it is the use of an overhead projector, PSI, behavioral objectives or criterion referenced tests. The faculty member must: (1) be aware of the innovation and know something about it; (2) perceive some personal need the innovation can fill; (3) seek out more detailed information about such things as the relative advantages of the innovation, its compatability with existing practice, its complexity, the ability to try the innovation in steps or small amounts, and the observability of the results of adopting the innovation; (4) form positive attitudes

toward the innovation; (5) try the innovation (or vicariously try it through the experience of peers); and (6) finally, seek confirmation of the ultimate decision to adopt the innovation (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971).

The Concept of Readiness to Innovate

Based on the Rogers model, we believe there must be a minimum level or degree of "readiness" prior to the decision to adopt an innovation. In fact, we suggest that there are two kinds of "readiness;" (1) individual readiness and (2) organizational readiness. By this we mean that both the individual faculty and his/her organization (department, unit, college, etc.) must be "ready" to adopt the innovation. Support for this notion of individual and organizational readiness comes from a recent study at Michigan State University which compared characteristics of innovators receiving instructional improvement grants with unsupported innovators (Sachs, 1977). This study found that both types of innovators had expended considerable effort in learning about instructional innovations, (e.g., readiness) through workshops, visits, readings, and consultation. However, departments of supported innovators showed less readiness (support for innovation). Hence, faculty bypassed their local organization (department) and instead went to an all-university granting mechanism for support. The point is that instructional innovation requires both individual and organizational readiness. Additional development of the concept of readiness is provided next, as we believe it is essential to understanding the FD, OD, and ID relationship.

Individual Faculty Readiness

Faculty readiness involves both awareness and knowledge about the innovation and about needs the innovation can fill. It also involves a period of information seeking by the faculty member.

A wide variety of faculty readiness-producing-activities have been described (Centra, 1976). These activities include such things as short seminars in which both those faculty who have adopted particular innovations and those who have not, interact about the innovation; financial support is provided for faculty travel to see innovations in use; or values clarification exercises and retreats are held.

The common element of all these activities is that they seek to create cognitive dissonance in faculty by providing alternatives to the status quo through presentation of realistic alternative instructional strategies and highlighting the ability of these alternatives to meet needs perceived as important by the faculty. These activities do not teach faculty the specifics of how to implement instructional innovations.

The next step in the process of creating readiness is to help faculty find out more about those innovations which most interest them. At this point in the adoption process, faculty will be most interested in such general issues as:

> What are the relative advantages of the innovation over the current way of doing things?
>
> How compatible is the innovation to the current way of doing things?
>
> How complex is the innovation?
>
> Is it possible to try the innovation in small steps or without undertaking a major reorganization of current activities?
>
> How observable will the results of the innovation be?

(Roger & Shoemaker, 1971, Chapter 4)

We suggest that there are two ways in which faculty readiness is achieved. One way involves planned interventions by the instructional improvement agency. The other way involves the faculty achieving their own readiness.

Based on data from the MSU study (Sachs, 1977) we believe those faculty who undertake adoption of instructional innovations on their own initiative have previously achieved the necessary state of readiness on their own through reading, attending conventions, workshops, talking with innovative colleagues, etc. These faculty come to instructional improvement agencies not to be persuaded, but to get more specific help on how to accomplish their innovative plans. The instructional improvement agency then reacts in response to these requests with specific skill workshops or individual consultation or by actually producing the innovation for the faculty member (see Davies, 1974; and Silber, 1975, for a discussion of the various roles of instructional improvement agencies). *The services provided after the decision has been made to adopt an innovation have traditionally been considered instructional development (ID) activities.*

However, not all instructional improvement agencies have been content to merely react to faculty initiatives. Instead, these agencies have sought to attract faculty members by actively creating this readiness. Instead of reacting, they are acting and focusing the faculty toward those innovations having high payoff or those which the instructional improvement agency is most equipped to support. Thus, there are reactive and proactive postures with respect to creating faculty readiness.

The important point, however, is this: Creating faculty readiness for instructional innovation is a crucial component of improving instruction. Furthermore, in our judgement, the activities conducted for the purpose of creating individual readiness to innovate are, and should be considered faculty development (FD).

Organizational (Social System) Readiness

The other type of readiness which must be accounted for if faculty are to succeed in adopting instructional innovations is social system or organizational readiness. Even if an inidivdual faculty member has been made aware of alternatives to the status quo and has been persuaded to try an innovation, the attitudes of others in the department, college, and institution as well as the characteristics and rules of that organization may prevent such an innovation. For example, the organization may not provide resources or even the freedom to innovate and may go so far as to punish those that try. While an individual faculty member can, and often does innovate without moral or financial support from his organization, such a situation is obviously not desirable in terms of longevity of the innovation, or further diffusion within the organization. Moreover, individual faculty who acquire new sensitivities and skills through FD workshops or retreats may revert to old habits when they return unless the organization is ready to support them. It must be recognized, therefore, that individual change (instructional innovation) must receive support from group policies and procedures if it is to be sustained. Furthermore, adoption of such teaching innovations on an individual faculty basis (such as PSI or competency based instruction) may necessitate structural or policy changes in the organization, such as admissions, grading, fee schedules, and faculty and graduate student workload.

In the case of organizational readiness, the posture of the instructional improvement agency may again be either reactive or proactive. If the posture is reactive, the instructional improvement agency will, in effect, wait until a department or other organization achieves readiness to accept innovation on its own initiative. On the other hand, the instructional improvement agency may take an active role in facilitating activities within the organization which will provide a suitable climate for innovation to take place.

If the instructional improvement agency elects to take an intervention role, a number of activities have been described in the literature (Gaff, 1975; Centra, 1976). These activities are typically group process based and focus on such topics as goal setting, conflict resolution, improvement in communication, evaluation of productivity, workloads, and resource allocation. For example, Michigan State University has developed a format for department or college self-studies which involve data collection, analysis and recommedations on most of the above topics (Dressel & Dietrich, 1968; Davis, et. al., 1976). The role of instructional improvement agency personnel in this context is to act as a group leader, facilitator and resource person to help department personnel conduct the study.

The important point here is this: Creating organizational readiness is the mirror image of creating individual readiness; both are crucial to the adoption of innovations to improve instruction. Furthermore, in our judgement, the activities conducted for the purpose of creating organizational readiness to innovate are, and should be considered, organizational development (OD).

RELATING FD, OD, AND ID TO IMPROVING INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

If one considers the numerous models of the ID process, (reviewed by Stamas, 1973) there is seldom, if ever, any provision for assessing or creating faculty or organizational readiness for change. Our ID models assume a necessary level of readiness or commitment already exists prior to the beginning of activities related to lesson, course or curricular development. On the other hand, we believe that ID activities or services only become relevant after a decision/commitment has been made to change something in the instructional process.

Thus, we believe that the relationship between FD, OD, and ID is that FD and OD provide the individual and organizational readiness necessary for the adoption of an instructional innovation. The instructional innovation is adopted, or developed during the ID phase of activities. We thus believe that there is a sequential or prerequisite relationship between FD, OD, and ID, in that *ID becomes possible only when faculty and organizational readiness is achieved through FD and OD activities.* Furthermore, individual and organizational readiness for change can be achieved with or without intervention by an instructional improvement agency.

The prerequisite relationship of FD and OD is based on an assumption of voluntary adoption of innovation. If change is mandated by administrative fiat, contract language or new laws, then faculty or organizational readiness becomes somewhat irrelevant.

Since each institution will differ regarding the characteristics of its faculty, its organization and its instruction, as well as on the state of readiness for innovation, the relative need for FD, OD, or ID activities (or other readiness activities) will differ from institution to institution. Furthermore, the posture of the instructional improvement agency will vary on a continuum from passive to active intervention in FD, OD, and ID.

We predict, however, that the increased pressures on faculty from declining budgets, declining enrollments, unionization, etc., will reduce the number of faculty attempting innovation on their own initiative so the survival and growth of an increasing number of instructional improvement agencies will become dependent on their ability to seek out and attract new faculty clients. Where it had been possible for these agencies to be successful in the past by focusing solely on instructional development types of activities because sufficient faculty and organizational readiness already existed in those faculty seeking service, a new approach will be required to cope with the changing needs of the faculty and institution. Hence, we believe the recent increase in interest in the discrete areas of faculty and organizational development portends this shift from a passive to a more active posture.

CONCLUSION

FD, OD, and ID are not new ideas, but useful expository devices. They allow us to categorize and label a number of activities which are fundamentally related to the adoption of innovations. The functions of

FD and OD are to create a level of individual and organizational readiness and commitment to change in teaching process or content. FD and OD in and of themselves do not directly affect a change in teaching process or content, but are prerequisite to it. Once a decision has been made to change, the ID process used in achieving the change in teaching practice may involve use of a systematic development model or it may involve a simple adoption of an existing technological device or teaching strategy.

We believe that FD, OD, and ID have been practiced for some time by a number of instructional improvement agencies actively involved in encouraging faculty to innovate. FD, OD, and ID are thus merely old wine in new wineskins.

What is new, is the increased interest in FD, OD, and ID as discrete activities. This, we feel, portends a change in emphasis for many instructional improvement agencies from a reactive stance to a more active one--attracting faculty rather than simply waiting for them to appear on their own.

In sum, we believe FD, OD, and ID in a voluntary system, to be hierarchally related to the innovation adoption process and of equal importance in improving instructional effectiveness.

Because these three areas are so closely linked to the concept of readiness for innovation, the question is not which of these three areas should be emphasized or undertaken, but rather how to assess and increase readiness for change at your institution.

APPENDIX 1

	ATTITUDE Faculty Development	PROCESS Instructional Development	STRUCTURE Organizational Development
Focus	Faculty members	Individual courses Curricula	Organizations
Purpose	Promote faculty growth Help faculty acquire needed knowledge, skills, sensitivities and techniques	Improve student learning	Create an environment which promotes effective teaching
Activities	Seminars Workshops Evaluations	New learning materials Redesign courses and/or curricula Workshops on setting objectives Evaluating students	Workshops for group leaders or team members Action research Revise organizational policies

Figure 1 Gaff Categorization

Source: Jerry G. Gaff, TOWARD FACULTY RENEWAL (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).

APPENDIX 1

	ATTITUDE	PROCESS	STRUCTURES
	Faculty Development	Instructional Development	Organizational Development
Focus	Individual faculty	Individual faculty Individual courses Curricula	Academic and administrative programs, departments and divisions
Purpose	Clarify values, attitudes and philosophies Improve intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning	Improve instructional effectiveness	Improve organizational effectiveness
Activities	Life planning Faculty interviews Interpersonal skills training Personal growth	Classroom observation and diagnosis Microteaching Instructional evaluation Instructional methodology and technology Course design Curriculum development	Team-building Conflict-management Decision-making Management training

Figure 2: Berquist & Phillips Categorization[1]

Source: William H. Berquist and Steven R. Phillips, "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," THE JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 46 (1975), 183.

[1] Recently, Berquist and Phillips (1977) presented another categorization model. For purposes of this paper, this model will not be dealt with, but readers are encouraged to study this model as well.

REFERENCES

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R., *A Handbook for Faculty Development*. Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R., *A Handbook for Faculty Development, Volume 2*. Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Centra, J. A., Faculty development in the United States: practices and programs. Paper presented at the Second International conference on Improving University Teaching, Heidelberg, Germany, July, 1976.

Davies, I. K., Some aspects of a theory of advice: the management of an instructional developer--client, evaluator--client, relationship. *Instructional Science*, 1975, 3, 351-373.

Davis, R. H., Abedor, A. J., & Witt, P. W. F., *Commitment to Excellence, A Case Study of Educational Innovation*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Educational Development Program, 1976.

Dressel, P. I., & Dietrich, J. F., Department review and self-study. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1968, 38(1), 25-37.

Gaff, J. G., *Toward Faculty Renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, 1975.

Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F., *Communication of Innovations, A Cross-Cultural Approach*. New York: The Free Press, 1971

Sachs, S. G., A study of instructional innovators at Michigan State University. *Educational Development at Michigan State University*, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Educational Development Program, Spring 1977.

Silber, K. H., Organizational and personnel management structures needed for the successful implementation of instructional development in educational institutions. Unpublished manuscript, Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois, 1975.

Stamas, S. T., Instructional Models. *Occasional Papers*, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Division for Instructional Development, 1973.